

Serial No.: 09/690,366
Response to Office Action of 01/17/2006

Docket No. 1005.6
Customer No. 53953

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 11, 16-20, 24, 25, 29 and 30 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, and 14-30 are pending. No new matter has been added.

Rejection of the claims

In the Office Action mailed January 17, 2006, claims 19, 20, 24, 25, 29 and 30 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Office Action stated that such claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended such claims accordingly, and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of such claims.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 6 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,769,096 ("Kuppusamy").

As amended, claim 1 recites:

1. A method performed by a computer system, comprising:
 - storing a version of a paper, the version being displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper;
 - at a first location within the version, detecting a reference to a second location, wherein the detected reference is at least one of the following, other than a computer network address: an alphanumeric character; a symbol; a term; and a phrase;
 - in response to the detected reference, embedding a hyperlink within the detected reference; and
 - when the first location is displayed on the display device, highlighting the first location to indicate the hyperlink as being selectable by a user to cause an operation associated with the second location.

Serial No.: 09/690,366
Response to Office Action of 01/17/2006

Docket No. 1005.6
Customer No. 53953

As amended, claim 6 recites:

6. A system, comprising:
a computing device for:
storing a version of a paper, the version being displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper;
at a first location within the version, detecting a reference to a second location, wherein the detected reference is at least one of the following, other than a computer network address: an alphanumeric character; a symbol; a term; and a phrase;
in response to the detected reference, embedding a hyperlink within the detected reference; and
when the first location is displayed on the display device, highlighting the first location to indicate the hyperlink as being selectable by a user to cause an operation associated with the second location.

As amended, claim 11 recites:

11. A computer program product, comprising:
a computer program processable by a computer system for causing the computer system to:
store a version of a paper, the version being displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper;
at a first location within the version, detect a reference to a second location, wherein the detected reference is at least one of the following, other than a computer network address: an alphanumeric character; a symbol; a term; and a phrase;
in response to the detected reference, embed a hyperlink within the detected reference; and
when the first location is displayed on the display device, highlight the first location to indicate the hyperlink as being selectable by a user to cause an operation associated with the second location; and
apparatus from which the computer program is accessible by the computer system.

MPEP § 2142 states, "...The examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any prima facie conclusion of obviousness. If the examiner does not produce a prima facie case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness..." Further, MPEP § 2143.01 states: "The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination."

Serial No.: 09/690,366
Response to Office Action of 01/17/2006

Docket No. 1005.6
Customer No. 53953

Moreover, MPEP § 2142 states: "...the examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical 'person of ordinary skill in the art' when the invention was unknown and just before it was made...The examiner must put aside knowledge of the applicant's disclosure, refrain from using hindsight, and consider the subject matter claimed 'as a whole.'" Thus, when evaluating a claim for determining obviousness, all limitations of the claim must be evaluated.

In relation to amended claims 1, 6 and 11, Kuppusamy is defective in establishing a prima facie conclusion of obviousness. For example, as between Kuppusamy and Applicant's specification, only Applicant's specification teaches the combinations of elements in amended claims 1, 6 and 11. In fact, Kuppusamy teaches away from such combinations.

In citing Kuppusamy, the Office Action states, a "heading is detected within the first location of the quarterly report" (emphasis added). Further, the Office Action states, a "hyperlink entry is created in the TOC document for each selected heading" (emphasis added).

As shown in Kuppusamy's Fig. 3, the target document 202 ("quarterly report," where the heading is detected) and the TOC document 220 (where the hyperlink is created) are independent windows, with each window simultaneously displaying a different document. This fact is explicitly taught in Kuppusamy at col. 6, line 63—col. 7, line 1, which states: (a) "a frameset 218" contains "the target document 202 and the TOC document 220"; and (b) "the term 'frameset' relates to the creation of two or more independent windows with each window simultaneously displaying a different document" (emphasis added).

Consequently, Kuppusamy teaches that: (a) the heading is detected in a first document (i.e., the target document 202, which is displayed in a first window), yet the hyperlink is created in a second document (i.e., the TOC document 220, which is displayed in a second window); and (b) the first and second windows are independent.

By comparison, claim 1 includes the following limitations: (a) "at a first location within the version, detecting a reference to a second location"; and (b) "in response to the detected reference, embedding a hyperlink within the detected reference; and when the first location is displayed on the display device, highlighting the first location to indicate the hyperlink as being selectable by a user to cause an operation associated with the second

Serial No.: 09/690,366
Response to Office Action of 01/17/2006

Docket No. 1005.6
Customer No. 53953

location” (emphasis added). Thus, Kuppusamy is contrary to claim 1.

Claim 6 includes the following limitations: (a) “at a first location within the version, detecting a reference to a second location”; and (b) “in response to the detected reference, embedding a hyperlink within the detected reference; and when the first location is displayed on the display device, highlighting the first location to indicate the hyperlink as being selectable by a user to cause an operation associated with the second location” (emphasis added). Thus, Kuppusamy is contrary to claim 6.

Claim 11 includes the following limitations: (a) “at a first location within the version, detect a reference to a second location”; and (b) “in response to the detected reference, embed a hyperlink within the detected reference; and when the first location is displayed on the display device, highlight the first location to indicate the hyperlink as being selectable by a user to cause an operation associated with the second location” (emphasis added). Thus, Kuppusamy is contrary to claim 11.

Clearly, therefore, Kuppusamy fails to teach amended claims 1, 6 and 11, and in fact teaches away from such claims. Thus, the motivation for advantageously combining the claimed elements would arise solely from hindsight based on Applicant’s teachings in its own specification.

Accordingly, in view of the reasons stated herein, and for other reasons clearly apparent, the PTO has not met its burden of factually supporting a prima facie conclusion of obviousness in this case, and Applicant has no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness.

Thus, a rejection of amended claims 1, 6 and 11 is not supported.

Conclusion

For these reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1, 6, 11 19, 20, 24, 25, 29 and 30.

Dependent claims 2, 4, 5 and 16-18 depend from and further limit claim 1 and therefore are allowable.

Dependent claims 7, 9, 10 and 21-23 depend from and further limit claim 6 and therefore are allowable.

Serial No.: 09/690,366
Response to Office Action of 01/17/2006

Docket No. 1005.6
Customer No. 53953


Dependent claims 12, 14, 15 and 26-28 depend from and further limit claim 11 and therefore are allowable.

An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, and 14-30 is requested.


To the extent that this Response to Office Action results in additional fees, the Commissioner is authorized to charge deposit account no. 50-3524.

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. If any unresolved aspect remains, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael A. Davis, Jr.
Registration No. 35,488

Date: April 17, 2006
Davis Law Group, P.C.
9020 N. Capital of Texas Hwy.
Bldg. 1, Suite 375
Austin, Texas 78759
Telephone 512-306-8324
Facsimile 512-306-8374
Docket Number: 1005.6

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below. | |
| Fax Number: | <u>571-273-8300</u> |
| Michael A. Davis, Jr. | |
| TYPE OR PRINT NAME | |
|  | |
| SIGNATURE | |
| April 17, 2006 | |
| DATE OF TRANSMISSION | |